

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AIRPORT SITES E AND F

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

MUNICIPAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS CO. LTD.	
ATTENTION	INITIAL
REC'D JUL 27 1972	
COPY TO	DATE INITIALS
REPLY	
FILE	PN

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO
OCTOBER, 1971

TRA-O
71

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report is to point out the advantages and disadvantages of proposed airport sites E (West of Hamilton) and F (Brock City). Both sites are evaluated in terms of three T.C.R. strategies:

- stimulation of growth in the eastern corridor
- establishment of a linear arrangement for a system of cities and services
- development of peripheral urban centres such as Port Hope/Cobourg

The establishment of the Airport at Site E has two important implications.

Development of high order ground accessibility both E/W and N/S would in itself establish an area of high growth potential as part of the system of urban places in Southern Ontario. This high accessibility allied with the power of an airport to focus growth (in an area of high servicing costs):

- will detract from the effectiveness of government measures to stimulate growth and services east of Toronto and,
- may create functional structuring problems in associated urban places (i.e. Hamilton, Brantford, Kitchener/Waterloo) due to excessive growth rates.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115463424>

It is imperative, for long-range provincial advantage, that the inauguration of a major western airport if it cannot be prevented be delayed until the eastern foothold is well established. Otherwise, the TCR concept could not be allowed to stand in its present form in the face of these factors, and the amendments likely would need to be quantum jumps (like the elimination of a tier or corridor).

Site F on the other hand partly satisfies the requirement for general economic stimulus in the eastern corridor, but falls short to an extent which may have the effect of stimulating growth in and adjacent to eastern Metropolitan Toronto, rather than in and near Oshawa, as desired. In addition, it contains the seeds of heavy noise impacts on future urban areas in the manner of Malton. Also, it carries implications of separate inefficient ground transportation linkages, rather than being located "on line" on one or other of the principal service-activity spines of Zone 1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	
TCR STRATEGIES USED TO REVIEW PROPOSED AIRPORT SITES E AND F	1
IMPACT ANALYSIS OF AIRPORT SITES E AND F	2
SITE F (Brock City)	2
Strategy #1	2
Strategy #2	4
Strategy #3	4
Other Observed Constraints and Opportunities	4
SITE E	5
Strategy #1	5
Strategy #2	6
Strategy #3	6
Other Observed Constraints and Opportunities	7
COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF SITE IMPACT UPON T.C.R. STRATEGIES	7

TCR STRATEGIES USED TO REVIEW PROPOSED
AIRPORT SITES E AND F

One of the main goals of the TCR Concept is to "increase the level of opportunity" for residents of the eastern and northern sectors of the Toronto Centred Region. In this sense "opportunity" is the notion of access to medium and high order activities, services and functions.

Towards achieving this goal -- "increase the level of opportunity" -- the concept involves the relevant strategies of:

Strategy #1 - Deflection to and stimulation of growth extending from the boundary of Metropolitan Toronto to Bowmanville, focussed on Oshawa.

Growth of the Toronto Region has tended to be westward and congested, and has not proceeded at the same tempo in the under-developed eastern corridor. Comparatively speaking the smaller centres of the eastern corridor do not provide the same level of opportunity as is available in the western corridor.

Stragegy #2 - Linearity which seeks as far as possible to align urban places and activity nodes along a series of more or less straight paths to take maximum advantage of superimposed de-

mand for transportation and services. The linear arrangement would generate sufficient traffic to make workable a highly sophisticated transportation system, thereby increasing the level of aggregate opportunity within the system of cities along this spine.

Strategy #3 - Decentralization to develop peripheral urban centres such as Port Hope/Cobourg. Growth will increase the range of services available in these centres and increase the level of opportunity to their hinterland.

IMPACT ANALYSIS OF AIRPORT SITES E AND F

Each of the sites is evaluated from the point of view of its impact upon achievement of the above strategies.

SITE F (BROCK CITY)

The selection of the site effectively preempts the sub-regional centre of Brock City from the two-tiered system of cities. The loss of this centre does not substantially alter the concept; however its selection does have varying degrees of impact upon the three strategies:

Strategy #1

The location of the Airport at site F would generally be a positive factor in the stimulation of growth in the eastern corridor.

However, the magnitude of this stimulation is tempered as the selected site does not assist fully in the establishment of the dominance of Oshawa. It is anticipated the primary residential impact will fall on the adjoining centres of Cedarwood, Pickering, Audley and Ajax and the industrial impact on East Metro. As well, the prospect of stimulation of such undesirable Zone 2 centres as Markham and Stouffville (Century City) is raised again.

The airport location at F partly satisfies the requirement for general economic stimulus in the eastern corridor, but falls short to an extent which may have the effect of stimulating growth in and adjacent to Metropolitan Toronto, rather than in and near Oshawa, as desired.

The goal here is to move Oshawa ahead as soon as possible in order to establish quickly the medium and higher order activities there and then subsequently stimulate growth in Ajax, Audley and Cedarwood. If growth is delayed at Oshawa, places like Cedarwood and Audley will establish their affinities with Metropolitan Toronto rather than Oshawa. In this regard, Site B is acceptable.

Strategy #2

Site F generally supports the notion that all regional generators and attractors should be on line and therefore well interconnected. Site F is acceptable in this regard as long as the transportation interchange between the regional public system and the airport public circulation system is at the southern extremity of the site.

Strategy #3

Site F provides more convenient access than Site E for long-haul service for Port Hope/Cobourg and Peterborough/Lindsay. However, it is not as favourable as the combination of Malton and Site B. An airport at Site F, with these user benefits, would positively foster decisions to locate at Port Hope/Cobourg and consequently assist the achievement of Strategy #3.

Other Observed Constraints and Opportunities

The utilization of Site F will have an effect upon the site locations of six regional activities:

- The site for the new City of Brock will be completely used by the Airport (Brock City site and Site F are virtually coincident).

- HEPC's proposed 500 K.V. lines on a N/S alignment along the west side of Duffins Creek, plus an E/W alignment immediately South of Claremont as well as a proposed transformer site south-west of Claremont, all would have to be relocated.
- The C.P.R. Peterboro Subdivision would have to be relocated which may create the opportunity to directly serve Site F. However, a slight northerly re-location of the C.P.R.'s Oshawa Sub-division would more advantageously serve Site F as it then would be "on line" of the second principal service-activity spine of Zone 1.
- Would impair public enjoyment of the important recreation/conservation elements of the mini-belts separating Cedarwood/Brock/Audley.
- The runways on Site F are positioned so that much of the flight path traverses the Parkway Belt. The proposed southerly E/W runway would create overflying of proposed second tier Audley City Centre.
- Added stimulation by the Airport could cause a northerly migration of the Zone 1 boundary at Brock, Audley, etc.

SITE E

Site E, which is located west of Hamilton, is generally compatible with plans for structuring the western sector of TCR. However, it detracts from expansion policies for the eastern corridor.

Strategy #1

As stated above, Site E competes directly with the provincial strategy to stimulate growth within the eastern corridor. Additional growth

potential here aggravates the servicing problems caused by rapid growth rates to the west of Metropolitan Toronto. It diminishes the opportunity for achieving a more balanced growth between areas east and west of Metropolitan Toronto. As far as strategy achievement is concerned, capital spent for facilities in the eastern corridor is more productive.

Strategy #2

Site E can be serviced by an extension of the principal spine of Zone 1, rendering it fully "on line". In this regard, Site E is a better westerly candidate than either Sites C or D.

Strategy #3

The stimulus of an airport is not needed in the western area, as both Hamilton and Kitchener/Waterloo are already beyond the lower threshold of self-sustaining development.

Potentially, the westerly extension of the second tier spine intersects with the evolving Kitchener/Waterloo/Hamilton/St.Catharines spine at Site E, creating a location with premium accessibility qualities. Development may gravitate to this location and thus compete

with the location of higher order activities at Hamilton, a T.C.R. regional-terminal centre.

Other Observed Constraints & Opportunities

The utilization of Site E will have an effect upon the site location of three regional activities:

- The major positive consideration of Site E is that it is compatible with plans for physical structuring of the western sector of T.C.R.
- The Niagara Escarpment is an effective edge to delimit urban development. Site E, within close proximity to the Escarpment, and sheltering behind it, reduces the chances for a repetition of the Etobicoke experience.
- It is possible that Site E is in conflict with H.E.P.C.'s plans for a 500 K.V. Line connecting Nanticoke to the Galt/Guelph/Kitchener/Waterloo complex.

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF SITE IMPACT UPON T.C.R. STRATEGIES

Site Strategy	E (West of Hamilton)	F (Brock City)
1 Eastern Stimulation	1	3
2 Linearity	2	2
3 Peripheral Centres	1	2
Total	4	7

LEGEND: WEIGHTS TO SUBJECTIVELY MEASURE STRATEGY
COMPATIBILITY

Good	-	3
Fair	-	2
Poor	-	1

Based on the above subjective evaluation,
Site F best complements the three selected strategies
which together help achieve the primary TCR goal to
increase the level of opportunity for future residents
of the eastern and northern corridors.

3 1761 11546342 4

